



Policy Roundtable for Child Care

222 South Hill Street, Fifth Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Phone: (213) 974-4103 • Fax: (213) 217-5106 • www.lacountychildcare.org

MEETING MINUTES

July 9, 2008

9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Eaton Canyon Nature Center

1750 North Altadena Drive

Pasadena, California

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Duane Dennis, Chair of the Policy Roundtable for Child Care (Roundtable), opened the meeting at 9:07 a.m. Members and guests were welcomed and invited to introduce themselves.

2. WHY LOS ANGELES NEEDS A CHILD CARE POLICY

As way of introduction to Mr. Nicholas Ippolito, Mr. Dennis spoke to Superintendent Don Knabe's interest in child care and development and, more recently his concern about the amount of child care and development funds returned to the State over the past three years. Mr. Dennis reminded members and guests of Supervisor Knabe's motion made in March 2008 that addresses this issue and charges the Chief Executive Office (CEO) to recommend a child care policy that cuts across County departments and First 5 LA and Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP).

Mr. Ippolito, Deputy to Supervisor Don Knabe, recognized the diversity of participants at the retreat, including representatives of County departments, First 5 LA, LAUP, legislative advocates, and direct service providers – all of whom have a critical role in shaping the child care policy. He reiterated Mr. Dennis's comments, stating that the Supervisor is pushing for a cohesive policy on child care. In part, Supervisor Knabe wants to ensure that funds allocated to the county are spent on meeting the child care needs of children and families. He continued by outlining some of the prevalent issues impacting children and families in Los Angeles County, beginning with the number of children on the Los Angeles Centralized Eligibility List (LACEL), adding that funds returned to the State has to do with how the money can be spent, not based on the lack of need. Mr. Ippolito also remarked on the disparate quality across child care and development programs and the opportunity that the Steps to Excellence Project (STEP) offers for improving quality and providing a service to the consumers of child care and development.

In closing, Mr. Ippolito positioned Supervisor Knabe as a "lightening bearer" for the development of a child care policy in broad terms. He relayed the Supervisor's four concept goals for child care and development as: availability, accessibility, affordability and quality. While there are lots of opinions about what constitutes quality, Mr. Ippolito suggested that everyone agrees the need falls within these four concepts. He added that child care and development need is a challenge for all families and has the potential to reach families through various sectors, including County departments. In addition, he suggested that retaining the dollars may mean offering additional full day services and addressing other issues that better meet needs of children and families. Finally,

participants in the retreat were invited to “bend the ears” of the Supervisors with ideas resulting from the retreat.

3. DEFINING THE NEXUS BETWEEN CHILD CARE AND COUNTY RESOURCES

Mr. Miguel Santana, Deputy CEO, provided an overview of efforts underway in the CEO to centralize executive authority of certain functions. Mr. Santana oversees the following: Child Support Services, Human Relations Commission, Children and Family Services, Military and Veterans Affairs, Community and Senior Services, Public Social Services, and the Service Integration Branch, under which fall the Office of Child Care and Housing and Homelessness Initiatives. Mr. Santana mentioned that his charge is to seek opportunities for greater integration and cohesiveness in the delivery of services. There are County departments serving the same individuals and families, for example Health Services, Public Social Services and Senior Services may be engaged with the same family or individual members of the same family. The challenge for the family and its members is often navigating through the maze of county services, any of which they may be eligible either as a family or individual. Mr. Santana stated that the current system has been working, but the charge of the Board of Supervisors and the CEO is “we can do better”. By doing better, the client/consumer is placed in the center and the role of the County is to adapt around the client rather than the burden on the client or the family to navigate through the maze of services. Mr. Santana stipulated that most of us want the same: for children, families and individuals to be safe, healthy and thrive economically. He continued that integrating services is more effective to meeting families’ needs than working in isolation. The biggest challenge, he posited, is identifying opportunities to integrate service delivery.

Mr. Santana believes that there is a tremendous opportunity to integrate services with child care and development and, for that, he appreciates Supervisor Knabe’s leadership. Currently, he sees no comprehensive way for families to gain information to make decisions about child care. To do better, Mr. Santana suggests again placing the child and family in the center of the work. He reflected on the current system designed based on complicated and fragmented funding streams that determine the delivery of service. Mr. Santana’s hope for the retreat is a discussion and blueprint of how to begin centralizing child care to make it more available and accessible to children and families. He challenged the retreat participants to set aside their representation of an organization or department to focus on the perspective of the child and the family in accessing child care and development services. He also suggested addressing goals for strengthening the role of the Office of Child Care for coordinating meeting the child care needs of County clients more efficiently.

Lastly, Mr. Santana reflected on the draft policy recommendations. He commented that it is less about the Policy Roundtable for Child Care (Roundtable) and what it is trying to achieve and more about the child and the family at the center. He offered that the work will be challenging, particularly in discussing the role of the Office of Child Care and the County departments and how things could be done differently. In the end, Mr. Santana articulated his job of supporting the work of the Roundtable and the Office of Child Care, however he will ask “how will this policy improve child care accessibility for families?” The work product should answer that question. He expects the Board of Supervisors to ask the same question and be concerned with outcomes.

Questions/comments:

- It will be important to break down the false dichotomy between child care and preschool. All child care and development programs are responsible for children’s safety, development and growth. Mr. Santana responded with an anecdote when he enrolled his child in a center. Upon asking his child’s prospective early educator about the academic

preparation of children enrolled in the program, she answered “A good child care center advances the development of the child.”

- Upon being asked whether the draft child care policy needs to be rewritten, Mr. Santana responded with the question “How is it going to improve child care accessibility?” He added that the Roundtable should be proud of its accomplishments to date and remarked on Ms. Kathy Malaske-Samu’s tenacity as an advocate. He reiterated his charge to the Roundtable to discuss strategies for strengthening the role of the Office of Child Care in the County.
- If it is difficult for an educated person with a good job to understand how someone can navigate systems, the criteria for services and why someone would be rejected, how can parents and the community with real needs manage? Removing the burden from the child and the family to navigate the systems by putting them in the center is a good idea. The Roundtable needs to understand in simple terms eligibility, then come up with innovative strategies so that child care and development monies are spent and eligible families are served. Mr. Santana responded by stating that he is looking for solid recommendations. Child care funding is complicated, however the client should not know that. Rather, “my child needs child care; how do I start?” A good place to start is by taking inventory and learning about ways in which the county touches upon issues of child care – how is it and where are commonalities? Our job is to present a seamless system to families.
- Have there been discussions at the county level regarding the mixed delivery system that currently exists for providing child care services? Mr. Santana answered that it is less about the delivery system and governance than it is about improving access for children and families.
- In the scheme of the County’s overall system with respect to human services, child care comparatively has a much smaller role due to the availability of funding and the provision of services limited to county employees or county contractors. This makes the question regarding policy rather challenging when County’s piece of the pie is smaller and facilitation or integration is a priority among County services. How can the County influence policy with respect to programs for which it has a smaller role? Mr. Santana’s reply is that the County has the ability to influence policy, internally as well as externally. He went on to say that the County needs to improve its own infrastructures, referring to the employee centers. He asked “how can we make these models and expand these services to other County facilities?”
- Ms. Martha Flammer reported that due to the County taking positions on the proposed State budget and legislation relating to child care and development issues, it now has more visibility. Legislators and advocates in Sacramento are showing an interest in what Los Angeles County is doing around child care. A greater voice in Sacramento makes a difference.
- There is a difference in how entities look at child care. CDE-contracted programs are focused on the early care and education of children, while DCFS has a social service orientation and the Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) is on welfare to work. Mr. Santana agreed that the goals should not be mutually exclusive. For instance, the parent who goes to work wants their child in a nurturing and enriching environment.
- The outcomes of the work from the retreat will be presented to Mr. Santana and Mr. Ippolito in the near future. There will also be an opportunity to present the work at the cluster meetings and with Department heads.
- The document will also be treated as a living document, with timeframes, yet with allowances to evolve. The goals are to demonstrate that work is being done and keep communication going. Mr. Santana challenged the group to operate with some level of urgency. In addition to a timeframe, he is interested in budgetary concerns. Mr. Ippolito

added that Supervisor Knabe intends to introduce legislation to address unspent funds in the next session. He will be seeking an author.

- A challenge was made to be creative in thinking about how to fold in licensed-exempt care and how families choose child care.

In closing, Mr. Dennis reiterated that the policy is a work in process and is not yet complete. He mentioned that child care is provided through a public/private delivery system, with the private part being much greater. The government is responsible for regulation, standards, and funding. Finally, research shows that participation of children and families in high quality prevents child maltreatment, thus reducing the risk of children entering the child welfare or probation systems.

Mr. Dennis introduced Ms. Dianne Philibosian, professor at California State University, Northridge and facilitator for the remainder of the retreat. Ms. Philibosian expressed her gratitude to Mr. Santana and Mr. Ippolito for bringing the issues of child care and development to the forefront with a sense of urgency.

4. NAVIGATING THE CHILD CARE ARENA IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Ms. Malaske-Samu provided the context for the remainder of the day. Her presentation included data on the numbers of children that reside in the county by age groups - breaking out those in families living below the Federal Poverty Level, by ethnicity, by English Language Learners, and by those receiving child welfare services. Next, she spoke about the benefits of high quality programs, followed by an overview of the current child care and development system in Los Angeles County, including the types of services, and the supply of services against the gap and by age groups. She ended by showing the nexus of child care and development services with other County services and community programs. For more detail, see the attached PowerPoint.

5. UNDERSTANDING THE CHILD CARE NEEDS OF COUNTY CLIENTS

Mr. Dennis introduced the panel of speakers, each with initiatives relating to child care and development services.

- Department of Children and Family Services

Ms. Angela Carter has been working for County systems most of her life and, she relayed, still does not understand eligibility. Traditionally DCFS has focused on the immediate causes that bring families to their attention and the needs related to those specific causes. She offered that DCFS needs to work harder on identifying and addressing other needs and rely on others to help with that work. While DCFS understands the importance of collaboration, it is one thing to talk about it, doing it is something else. Ms. Carter maintains that families with whom DCFS work have the same needs as “us” and offered that if we are struggling to figure out the maze of services, how are families doing it.

Historically, DCFS had broader partnerships with child care and development services, yet over the years it has had a diminished capacity. Currently, DCFS has \$16.5 million in funding to provide child care subsidies for 1,550 children. She admitted that DCFS needs to work much more comprehensively to identify the child care and development needs of all the children they serve. In addition to the children under the supervision of DCFS, there are children at risk not in their care. To that end, DCFS is partnering with others on the Prevention Initiative Demonstration Project, which is a 12 month initiative designed to pilot a new way of working to improve the outcomes of children DCFS never sees. According to Ms. Carter, “this is a heck of a challenge”.

Resources exist throughout the county with expertise in knowing how important it is to work with others to meet needs of families. She said it is more than parenting skills, domestic violence prevention and intervention, substance abuse, and mental health: it is also about jobs and economic stability. Although these latter areas are not considered DCFS business, families need it. As a partner involved with the initiative, DCFS is working with child care and development programs, schools, cities, and institutional partners (i.e. UCLA) across the eight Service Planning Areas. In each area, there are network leads closer to the issues who know families, and have a track record of success working as partners. It is all about partnerships to achieve healthier communities, stronger families and thriving children.

Questions/comments:

- Given the number of children under the supervision of DCFS, what other options exist to meet their child care and development needs? Some children are in relative care where there is a need for respite and support. Many families engaged with DCFS have the same access to child care and development resources as other families, but face additional stressors given what is going on in the family and where relatives are stepping up to take care of the children. Is it realistic to expect them to surmount the difficulties and locate care?
- A strategy is needed to connect children after 18 months of receiving child care services through DCFS. Families may still be at risk, but who can step up to the plate.
 - Department of Mental Health

Dr. Bryan Mershon, Acting District Chief, Child, Youth and Family Program Administrator, MHSA Children's Programs, presented on behalf of Ms. Olivia Celis who was called for jury duty. Their office works with families with extreme needs, including housing, cash assistance and child care and development, and while family members are receiving mental health services. The Department of Mental Health (DMH) is trying to restructure their service delivery to occur in the family home or another location convenient to the family in order to reduce stress relating to child care and other needs. This is also an issue for families needing to visit a psychiatrist who is managing their medication. Adult clients with serious mental health concerns have ongoing child care needs for their children. In addition, children with extreme behavioral problems or emotional disturbances, even if the family has resources, face challenges in child care and development programs, many of which lack the qualifications and resources to meet the child's needs.

The Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) has a small fund to pay for respite care for children receiving mental health services. It has been operational countywide for 15-18 months, however is underutilized. DMH is looking at how to roll out this service to meet the needs of more clients. Dr. Mershon also relayed that in the past, DMH sponsored trainings for child care providers that included how to use mental health consultation for child care and development agencies. There was a lot of enthusiasm for the training, however there were problems finding funding for the services. DMH is hoping that through the Prevention and Early Intervention initiative under the MHSA there will be a provision to fund mental health consultation in child care and development programs. DMH is aware of the potential harm that can occur to children enrolled in mediocre programs, so they are advocating for high quality and see the potential in H.R. 3289 (Hirono), a federal bill that would provide funds to raise the quality of preschool programs if passed.

Questions/comments:

- Dr. Jacquelyn McCroskey relayed that Ms. Celis understands the nexus of systems that support young children and suggested the conversations continue.
- Ms. Flammer expressed her interest in progress made with First 5 LA's effort relating to conducting developmental screenings of children enrolled in child care and development programs.
- MHSA is funding the Full Partnership Services Program. A portion of the funds is targeted to children from birth to 13 years old. There are 730 slots available for the children. Some of the slots serve children under the auspices of DCFS and Probation. The slots allocated for children from birth to five years old are under enrolled; challenges exist with outreach. In addition, staff training is needed to serve this young population.
- The Infant, Childhood and Relationships Enrichment Network (ICARE) steering committee is concerned that not all agencies have the capacity to serve young children and have identified training as a focus. Efforts are underway to ensure services to young children are considered a priority for PEI and need to include training to build capacity of the mental health system to serve young children.
 - Department of Public Social Services

Mr. Phil Ansell introduced his presentation with a closing thought around the potential opportunity between children on food stamps and child care. The Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) administers the California Work Opportunities and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program, which provides temporary financial assistance and employment focused services to families with minor children. Currently, 140,000 families are receiving CalWORKs benefits and a number of them are involved in the welfare to work program. Child care is limited to families participating in the welfare to work program. CalWORKs Child Care is provided in three stages, however in its move towards seamlessness, Los Angeles County contracts with the Alternative Payment (AP) Programs to administer Stage 1. This arrangement facilitates families' transfers to Stages 2 and 3, also administered by the AP Programs with funding that comes through the California Department of Education/Child Development Division (CDE/CDD). Mr. Ansell noted the conundrum in that CalWORKs Child Care is an entitlement for families engaged in welfare to work activities that pays at 85% of the Regional Market Rate (RMR). Yet, lots of parents experience problems with child care, the key to their ability to obtain and maintain employment and remain off of the CalWORKs rolls.

Mr. Ansell reported that DPSS contracted with the Chief Executive Office, Service Integration Branch (CEO/SIB) to conduct a study to look at child care utilization. Half of all requests were denied because parents failed to complete the application process and paperwork. A number of people were involved in reviewing the study results and arrived at consensus on recommendations for improving access to Child Care Stage 1. The recommendations are pending submission to the Department Heads as well as others. The recommendations will take time to implement, however should make a difference. Mr. Ansell reported that the key policy issue is ensuring continued availability of funding, particularly for Stage 3. Since 1998, families have retained their entitlement to child care funded by the general system and have not needed to compete with other families eligible for child care subsidies. If funding for Stage 3 is lost, families may be forced to return to CalWORKs or compete with other families for services.

Mr. Ansell returned to his final point. Medi-Cal and Food Stamps serve low-income and poor people, mostly children and parents. These two programs have the most contact with low income children in the County with the exception of public schools. Historically, we have not

leveraged these resources as potential vehicles for sharing information about child care with low-income families. Sixty percent of CalWORKs families are not in the welfare to work program, either because they are relative caregivers or are part of the immigrant population. Both groups have incomes of up to 130% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). They are poor or close to being poor and therefore would be prioritized for subsidized child care. DPSS suggested using their relationship with families using Food Stamps and Medi-Cal and reaching out to them through the mail. DPSS could allow access to their sophisticated database system, which can sort data by age, geography and language.

Questions/comments:

- Families with the severest degree of difficulty due to issues such as mental health, domestic violence, etc. are most likely to be refused for child care. The study did not say directly the cause of not accessing child care. DPSS does not have the answers, needing to explore it further.
- Mailings are expensive when considering the cost of postage and duplication. Mr. Ansell noted that mailing costs are real and the County is in the tightest position ever in a decade. It may be possible to build upon the face-to-face contact DPSS has with clients. Another option is targeted mailings to specific populations. Another issue to consider is the surplus demand for child care and defining its purpose. It may call for a comprehensive strategy with a comprehensive set of partners.

6. CHILD CARE RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO COUNTY CLIENTS

- California Department of Education Child Development Centers

Ms. Arlene Rhine provided an overview of CDE/CDD-contracted child development centers, operated by universities, school districts, corporations, and private, nonprofit organizations. Most of the programs recruit families off of the Los Angeles Centralized Eligibility List (LACEL). Universities are exempt from using the LACEL to recruit families as they only take children of their students. Ms. Rhine stated that the biggest challenge for child development programs is obtaining verification to ensure a family's eligibility for the program. Sometimes parents present proof that does not match what they reported on the LACEL, others lack documentation or face challenges at gathering their documented proof of eligibility. Likewise, programs have problems deciphering the proof and what constitutes proof, requiring them to seek out help from their CDE/CDD consultant.

Ms. Rhine continued by explaining that many programs manage multiple grants without the flexibility to move money around to meet the needs of children and families. She expressed a need for infants and toddlers, but dollars cannot be transferred from preschool to this younger age group. She added that when the center at California State University Northridge raised their staff salaries, they dropped their subsidized spaces for infants and toddlers and turned them into spaces for fee paying parents because they could otherwise not meet their operational costs. Lastly, Ms. Rhine stated that every family needs an advocate to help them navigate the child care system.

- Head Start

Ms. Sarah Younglove described Head Start as a federally funded program for low-income families, the poorest of the poor. Each Head Start agency conducts a community assessment to determine need and establish priorities for enrollment, for example grandparents as parents or teen parents may be prevalent in a community and therefore receive more points. The points

are added and determine who receives priority for enrollment, with the rest going on a waiting list. The Los Angeles County Office of Education has the largest funded Head Start Program in the country. It serves 24,000 children through its 26 contracted agencies, of which half are school districts and the rest private nonprofits. Early Head Start Programs target children from birth through three years old, and Head Start Preschool serves four and five year olds. The current Federal Administration's priority for children enrolled in Head Start is to ensure that they are ready for school and the readiness is tested. The previous administration prioritized working with the whole family on the theory that you can make difference in the child if you also make a difference in the life of the family. Head Start also provides comprehensive services, including mental health, social services, and health. Head Start believes that it is vitally important to give one to one service to empower families. Currently, there is a big emphasis on governance and holding the governing body accountable. Parent involvement in the form of an advisory is also key and considered an opportunity for parents to make decisions that impact the lives of children and families. Lastly, Head Start pays for a State collaboration office in each state to make sure that Head Start is collaborating across the board.

Ms. Younglove referred members to the distributed packets for more information on Head Start.

- Los Angeles Unified School District

Mr. Whit Hayslip distributed copies of the handout entitled *Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD): Summary of District Services to Children Birth to Five Years of Age*. LAUSD administers seven child care and development programs serving a total of 35,893 children. The programs include California School Age Families Education Program (Cal-SAFE), California Early Start Services – Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C, CDE/CDD General Child Care, CDE/CDD State Preschool, School Readiness Language Development Program (SRLDP), CDE/CDD Pre-Kindergarten and Family Literacy (PKFL) Program, and Preschool Special Education - Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B. For more information on the programs and the numbers of children served by each program, see the handout.

- Los Angeles Universal Preschool

Dr. Celia Ayala gave a brief overview of Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP), including a bit of history. LAUP was birthed by First 5 LA in 2004 to ensure that children are ready for kindergarten by providing high quality preschool services are targeted to four-year olds. First 5 LA contracted with the newly formed organization with five years of funding totaling \$580 million. Dr. Ayala mentioned the failure of Proposition 82, which would have provided ongoing funding for universal preschool. LAUP has shifted its facility development to ensure that the existing preschool programs maintain their high levels of quality services. Recently, the First 5 LA Commissioners extended current funding to LAUP to 2016, with the intent of LAUP reducing its dependency on First 5 LA funds in the future.

LAUP currently has 377 preschool centers providing programs and services, with a goal of reaching 400 sites in Los Angeles County. LAUP uses a mixed delivery model comprised of public, private, nonprofit organizations and includes licensed centers and family child care homes. Children are eligible to enroll in a LAUP program if they live in Los Angeles County and are four years old. Families receive the services at no or low cost. Similar to Head Start, LAUP offers comprehensive services. LAUP also has a coaching model designed to help build the quality of programs with LAUP classrooms. Fiscal coaches help child care programs operate as businesses. Community network operations work with family child care home

providers and center staff. Reimbursement is based on the quality rating, which looks at staffing, the Environment Rating Scale scores, parent involvement, and serving English Language Learners and children with special needs. The bottom line is children enter kindergarten ready to learn.

For more information on LAUP, see the packet of materials distributed by Dr. Ayala.

- Alternative Payment/Resource and Referral

Ms. Cristina Alvarado and Ms. Grace Weltman presented an overview of the child care resource and referral agencies and Alternative Payment Programs on behalf of the Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles (the Alliance). The Alliance is a partnership of 13 community-based organizations that administer child care subsidies for 60,000 plus children from birth to age 12 per month. The organizations administer both the Alternative Payment Program and CalWORKs Child Care subsidy dollars. Ten of the Alliance members also serve as child care resource and referral (R&Rs) agencies. Among the services provided by the R&Rs are free referrals to families seeking child care, parent education on quality child care, and training and technical assistance to providers. Ms. Alvarado and Ms. Weltman relayed information on the Alliance's child care service history involving partnerships in Los Angeles County and a summary of their approach to program and service integration. For more details, see their PowerPoint presentation.

- First 5 Los Angeles

Ms. Kate Sachnoff identified First 5 LA's three goal areas as safety, early learning and health. First 5 LA focuses on system improvement that addresses the needs of children prenatally through age five and their families. Their general approach is prevention oriented. While child care is one component, it is addressed through multi-pronged strategies and initiatives: universal preschool; school readiness; family literacy; community developed initiatives to expand capacity and improve services; and workforce development, among others. Ms. Sachnoff also mentioned efforts underway relating to systems improvement and research and evaluation, such as the universal preschool child outcome study and Latino family early education utilization rates. On the policy front, First 5 LA is collaborating with others to identify and advocate solutions to issues impacting the lives of children, families, and communities. Ms. Sachnoff closed by mentioning First 5 LA's call for Letters of Intent under their Community Opportunities Fund – Cycle Two, which addresses organizational capacity building and policy and advocacy. Dr. McCroskey added that the emphasis will be on agencies that have not received First 5 LA funds in the past. Further information on First 5 LA and their initiatives is in the handouts.

7. SMALL GROUP ACTIVITY

Ms. Philibosian thanked all speakers, and then launched into the instructions for the small group activity. She acknowledged that the same conversations around child care and development have been occurring for the past 40 years. She noted that a tremendous amount of progress has been made over the past 60 years, however the difference now is that it is not just on the ground service people saying we need to do something different. Legislators, policy makers and administrators are also saying things need to be done differently. Furthermore, power brokers at the highest levels are willing to help create solutions to make things happen and this thinking should help the field move forward. Ms. Philibosian challenged Roundtable retreat participants to rely on their shared vision from the perspective of children and families and not be bound by details. Ms. Philibosian then directed retreat participants to the flip charts and the two questions listed on the meeting agenda:

- How could the unspent child care dollars be used to fill service gap and improve accessibility to create more user friendly system?
- What are the barriers to using funds for these purposes?

Before everyone broke for lunch, Ms. Philibosian introduced the small group facilitators: Dr. McCroskey, Ms. Terry Ogawa, Mr. Hayslip, and Mr. Dennis.

8. REPORT OUT AND BRAINSTORM SOLUTIONS

The small group reports are included in Attachment A. Ms. Philibosian commended the work completed in the small groups. She charged the facilitator and recorder of each group to pick two top ideas and report back to the larger group on those items. Attachment B lists those items and summarizes the group discussion regarding solutions and champions.

Ms. Philibosian congratulated the participants on their accomplishments, but noted that the work was not complete. In addition to identifying solutions and champions for the last three items, the Roundtable would need to seize opportunities to meet both short and long-term goals. The County's child care policy should serve as a tool to mobilize persons and organizations across disciplines, provide a shared vision and promote a unified voice that brings child development to the policy forefront.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Dennis asked for public comment and none was offered.

10. ROUNDTABLE BUSINESS

- a. Approval of Meeting Minutes for June 11, 2008

Ms. Rhine made a motion to approve the minutes; Ms. Connie Russell seconded the motion. The minutes were accepted unanimously.

- b. Election of Officers

Ms. Rhine reported on behalf of the Nominating Committee by nominating Mr. Dennis and Ms. Connie Russell to continue as Chair and Vice Chair respectively. Nominations were called for from the floor. None were offered. Mr. Robert Wiltse seconded the Nominating Committee's motion. The motion passed unanimously.

11. COLLEAGUE AGENCY REPORTS

- First 5 LA Strategic Planning Process

Report postponed to the September meeting.

- Action on Childhood Obesity by the Commission for Children and Families

Report postponed to the September meeting.

12. STEPS TO EXCELLENCE PROJECT (STEP) ANNUAL REPORT

Written report in draft distributed to members.

13. CHILD CARE POLICY: STRATEGY FOR SEEKING ENDORSEMENTS

Roundtable members received the timeline for seeking endorsements of the child care policy and a partial listing of community organizations from which to seek endorsements. Ms. Malaske-Samu asked for suggestions on who else should receive the child care policy to comment. She can accept input until July 30, 2008 to allow enough time to incorporate the suggested changes for comment by the Roundtable in mid-August before it goes out for broader distribution for further response. The Roundtable will vote on the child care policy at the September meeting.

14. PUBLIC COMMENT

No meeting in August. Reconvene in September

15. CALL TO ADJOURN

Mr. Dennis thanked everyone for their participation in the retreat, with special shout out to Dr. McCroskey and Mr. Hayslip for their help with the planning.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Commissioners Present:

Ms. Maria Calix
Mr. Duane Dennis
Ms. Ann Franzen
Mr. Whit Hayslip
Ms. Kathy House
Ms. Sheri Lewis
Dr. Jacquelyn McCroskey
Ms. Joan McGowan
Ms. Holly Reynolds
Mr. Matt Rezvani
Ms. Arlene Rhine
Ms. Connie Russell
Mr. Robert Wiltse
Ms. Mika Yamamoto
Ms. Ruth Yoon

Guests:

Ms. Cristina Alvarado, Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles
Mr. Phil Ansell, Department of Public Social Services
Dr. Celia C. Ayala, Los Angeles Universal Preschool
Ms. Telma Bayona, Compton Unified School District
Mr. John Berndt, Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE)
Ms. Veronica Bravo, Pomona Unified School District
Ms. Angela Carter, Department of Children and Family Services
Mr. Richard Cohen, Westside Children's Center
Ms. Victoria Evers, CEO, Intergovernmental Affairs
Ms. Martha Flammer, CEO, Intergovernmental Affairs (Sacramento)
Ms. Lauren Hernandez, Board of Supervisors, District 1
Ms. Sandy Hong, UCLA Center for Improving Child Care Quality
Mr. Nicholas Ippolita, Deputy, Fourth Supervisorial District
Ms. Karen Kaye, Connections for Children
Dr. Bryan Mershon, Department of Mental Health
Ms. Leann Negron, First 5 LA
Ms. Terry Ogawa, Los Angeles County Education Coordinating Council
Ms. Dianne Philibosian, Meeting Facilitator
Ms. Kate Sachnoff, First 5 LA
Mr. Miguel Santana, Chief Executive Office
Ms. Peggy Sisson, City of Pasadena
Ms. Carmen Steward, Compton Unified School District
Ms. Jeanette Valentine, Pathways
Ms. Grace Weltman, Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles
Ms. Sarah Younglove, LACOE/Head Start Programs

Staff:

Ms. Mariela Balam
Ms. Helen Chavez
Ms. Laura Escobedo
Ms. Kathy Malaske-Samu
Ms. Martha Navarette
Ms. Michele Sartell